

Customer No. 27061  
Confirmation No. 7333

Patent  
Attorney Docket No. GEMS8081.081

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of : Zhang et al.  
Serial No. : 09/681,483  
Filed : April 13, 2001  
For : Method and System to Request Remotely Enabled Access  
to Inactive Software Options Resident on a Device  
Group Art No. : 2135  
Examiner : Dada, B.

---

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10**

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

**Mailing**

- ☐ deposited with the US Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**37 CFR 1.8(a)**

**37 CFR 1.10**

- ☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail ☐ As "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

**Transmission**

- ☐ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No.: 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Dada at the Patent and Trademark Office.  
☒ transmitted by EFS-WEB addressed to Examiner Dada at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: October 2, 2006

/Robyn L. Templin/  
Signature

---

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R §§1.191 AND 1.192**

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is being filed in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed on July 6, 2006.

1. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is General Electric Company, the Assignee of the above-referenced application by virtue of the Assignment to General Electric Company recorded on May 18, 2001, at reel 011832, frame 0040.

2. **RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellant is unaware of any other appending appeals or interferences related to this Appeal. This Appeal Brief is filed in response to the Advisory Action mailed on June 21, 2006. The undersigned is Appellant's legal representative in this Appeal. General Electric Company, the Assignee of the above-referenced application, as evidenced by the documents mentioned above, will be directly affected by the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

3. **STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15-17 and 19-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 17, 19-29, and 31 are currently under final rejection and, thus, are the subject of this appeal. Claims 1-6, 8-13, 15, 16, and 30 are in condition for allowance. Claims 7, 14, and 18 have been cancelled.

4. **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

The Appellant has not submitted any amendments subsequent to the Advisory Action mailed on June 21, 2006.

5. **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

A method to access one or more inactive options resident on a device remotely located from a centralized facility is called for in claim 1 and includes the steps of accessing a graphical user interface (GUI) (102) electronically linked to a centralized facility and configured to facilitate selection from a number of option identifying parameters and selecting at least one of the number of option identifying parameters for identification of one or more inactive options resident on the device (112). *Application*, ¶¶ 27-28. The method also includes the steps of transmitting an electronic request for activation of the selected one or more inactive options to the centralized facility, wherein the electronic request is transmitted via a public communication interface (18), *Id.* at ¶ 29, and authorizing transmission and installation of a software key in response to the electronic request (116, 120), *Id.* at ¶ 29, wherein the transmission of the software key is via a private communication interface such that the private communication interface electronically connects the centralized facility to the device. *Id.* at ¶31.

In accordance with another aspect of the current invention, claim 9 calls for an access granting system (10) having a computerized network (18) and a device (12, 14) having at least one non-enabled software application resident in memory thereon. *Application*, ¶ 17. The access granting system (10) also includes a plurality of computers (22), *Id.* at ¶ 18, connected to the

computerized network, wherein at least one of the plurality of computers displays selection data to a user in a form of a graphical user interface (GUI) (200). *Id.* at ¶ 33. Access granting system (10) further includes a remote centralized facility (16), *Id.* at ¶ 19, electronically connected to the device and having a database, wherein the remote centralized facility (16) includes a computer programmed to: receive a host ID input, wherein the host ID corresponds to a physical location of the device; identify a user selection of the at least one non-enabled software application; receive a request from an authorized user requesting enablement of the identified user selection; generate a software enabler designed to permit access to the selected non-enabled software application in accordance with the received request; and transmit the software enabler from the centralized facility to the device. *Id.* at ¶¶ 27-31.

In accordance with yet another aspect of the current invention, claim 17 calls for a computer data signal process embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions originating from a computer program executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to display a GUI (200) configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device (102). *Application*, ¶ 27. The processor also receives an input of a device identifier (106), receives a selection of a usage period (114), and receives a selection of an inactive option for enablement from the GUI (112). *Id.*, ¶¶ 27-28. The processor further causes a remote centralized processing station to generate a code configured to enable the selected inactive option after successful processing of the received inputs and selections (130, 134) and transmit the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface (136, 138). *Id.* at ¶¶ 29-31.

According to a further aspect of the current invention, claim 24 calls for a GUI to request activation of an inactive software program resident in memory of a medical imaging scanner remotely located from a centralized processing center comprising a device modality selector (226) and a system identification field (222). *Application*, ¶ 10. A user identification field (224), software program selector (232), and a software key generation tab (246) are also set forth. *Id.* at ¶ 10. User selection of the software key generation tab (246) transmits a data transmission over a public communication connection to the centralized processing center, wherein the data transmission represents a request to activate the inactive software program resident in memory of the medical imaging scanner over a private communication connection. *Id.* at ¶ 10.

**6. GROUND OF REJECTION:**

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101. Additionally, claims 17, 19, 21-23 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by

Moeller et al. (USP 6,694,384). The Examiner has further rejected claims 20 and 24-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moeller et al. in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art.

## 7. **ARGUMENT**

### **Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §101**

#### Claims 17 and 19-23

The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19-23 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to unpatentable subject matter. Claim 17 calls for a computer data signal process embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions originating from a computer program executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to carry out a sequence of process steps. Appellant contends that claim 17 calls for a statutory process that is directed to a practical application of a data signal.

In the Advisory Action of June 21, 2006, the Examiner rejected the claim, stating that "claim 17 is directed to a data signal, a data signal does not fall within one of the four statutory classes of 101." *Advisory Action*, 06/21/06, pg. 2. The Examiner's continued rejection ignores the substance of what is being called for in the claim. Claim 17 calls for a computer implemented process. Computer-implemented processes are statutory so long as they are limited to a practical application within the technological arts. *See* MPEP § 2106; *see also* Diamond v. Diehr, 450 U.S. 175, 183-184 (1981). A claim is limited to a practical application when the process, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the process recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible, and useful. MPEP § 2106; *see* AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., 172 F.3d 1352, 1358 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Claim 17 recites the practical application of a process that causes a processor to perform a series of process steps. The process acts carried out by the processor are a practical application of the process in that they cause the processor to: display a GUI, cause a remote processing station to generate a code, and transmit the code to a device having an inactive option. The process therefore produces a concrete, tangible, and useful result, and thus results in a practical application. In light of the foregoing, Applicant believes that claim 17, and the claims dependent therefrom, are directed to statutory subject matter. As such, Applicant respectfully requests the Board to withdraw the rejection under §101.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as Being Anticipated by Moeller et al. (USP 6,694,384)**Claims 17, 19, 21 and 22

Claim 17 has been rejected as being anticipated by Moeller et al. Claim 17 calls for, in part, a computer data signal process originating from a computer program executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to display a GUI configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device, cause a remote centralized processing station to generate a code configured to enable the inactive option and transmit the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface.

In making the §102(e) rejection, the Examiner asserted that “Moeller teaches displaying a GUI (i.e., selection from a menu) configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device... [column 4, lines 29-35 and lines 63-67] and transmitting the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface [column 4, lines 41-46 and column 5, lines 1-10].” *Advisory Action*, supra at 2. The Examiner reached this conclusion notwithstanding that Moeller et al. fails to teach or suggest the use of a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device that is different from a second communication interface for transmitting the code to the device.

Moeller et al. is directed to a method and system to remotely configure business office devices to user defined parameters. Specifically, the reference discloses “a method and system for configuring and/or re-configuring an office device to satisfy each user’s particular needs.” *Moeller et al.* ’384, Abstract. Moeller et al. further states:

**FIG. 2 illustrates the method in which a user selects the desired soft features 40 for the limited feature scanner 50. Initially, the user obtains a limited feature scanner from the scanner company. The scanner is equipped to provide a number of features, however, these features are initially disabled and/or set at a minimum level. After accessing the system configuration port 30, the user enters a scanner unit identification number (ID) 170 unique to the user's limited feature scanner 50. The system configuration port 30 confirms the ID 170 and uploads to the user's PC 10 those soft features 40 that are currently available. The user then selects those soft features 40 that he wishes to enable or download to his limited feature scanner 50. Payment 190 for the soft features 40 is then secured via a secured internet transaction or other secure means. After payment, the user then receives an access key or access code 140 to enter into the scanner for the scanner to configure itself by enable the features selected, and disabling the unselected features when necessary.**

The access key 140 is entered into the limited feature scanner 50 either by the user via an alphanumeric keypad on the scanner or via the workstation keypad, or by sending a code or file of information to be loaded into the PC workstation. The limited feature scanner 50 then configures its soft features 40 in accordance with the access key 140 provided to it by the user. The user can then reconfigure the scanner by repeating the above described steps.

In an alternate embodiment of the invention, the system configuration port, utilizing either the internet connection model 20 or the download application 25 enables and/or disables the hard features of the limited feature scanner 50 in accordance with desire or requirements of the user.

*Id.*, Col. 4, ll. 27-58.

As set forth above, Moeller et al. discloses a system whereby a user accesses a list of available features through an interface on the office device to be reconfigured. Once the desired features are selected, payment is secured over the internet or other secure means. The user then receives an access key or code to input into the scanner. In an alternate embodiment, Moeller discloses that the access key can be sent to the office device directly. *See id.* at Col. 4, ll. 46-50. In neither case, however, is the feature enablement request made over a first communication interface and access key or code transmission over a second communications interface that is different from the first communications interface. In the system of Moeller et al., both the request and the key transmission are transmitted over the internet or other secure means. There is no disclosure for use of two different communication interfaces.

In another embodiment, Moeller et al. discloses that a feature enablement request can be made in a telephonic request initiated by a user. This alternate embodiment is described below.

FIG. 3 illustrates a flow chart of another embodiment of the present invention in which a user can remotely configure the scanner by telephoning the scanner company, when the user does not have access to a modem or internet connection. In this embodiment, the user calls the scanner company to turn on the desired feature selected from a menu at step 200. The user provides the scanner company the user's information, the scanner ID number, and the desired features at step 210. In turn, the scanner company gives the user an access code at step 220 which will allow the scanner to configure itself. The scanner company maintains a database of the user's information and the access code. The access code can take any form, but preferably is a unique set of letters and numbers corresponding to any possibly menu selection, i.e., any combination of features.

Once the access code is provided to the user, the billing cycle commences and the customer is billed at step 240. The customer inputs the access code into the scanner at step 260, and the scanner configures itself or enables the selected menu items, at step 270.

*Id.* at Col. 4, ll. 59-67 and Col. 5, ll. 1-11.

In this embodiment, Moeller et al. discloses that, in response to a telephonic request, “the scanner company gives the user an access code ... which will allow the scanner to configure itself...The customer inputs the access code into the scanner...” *Id.* As such, both the request and the access key are transmitted in a common communications interface – namely, a telephone call. This is in stark contrast to that called for in claim 17, which calls for a first communications interface to facilitate a feature enablement request and a second communications interface to facilitate a key transmission, the second communications interface being different from the first communications interface.

Moeller et al. clearly discloses that both the request and the key transmission for configuring an office device are made over the same communication interface. The Examiner has improperly identified two separate communication interfaces in the described embodiments. Nowhere in the above description is the feature enablement request made over a first communication interface and access key or code transmission over a second communications interface that is different from the first communications interface. Instead, both the request and the key transmission are made over the same interface, that being only one of either the internet, telephone, or other secure means. Claim 17 specifically calls for an enablement request to be made over a first communication and for transmission of a code over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface. Therefore, Moeller et al. cannot anticipate that which is called for in claim 17. As such, claim 17 and the claims that depend therefrom, including claims 19, 21, and 22, are patentably distinct over the art of record.

#### Claim 23

Claim 23, which is dependent from claim 17, additionally calls for the GUI to be configured to allow selection of one of a trial use period, a limited use period, a pay-per-use period, and an indefinite use period for the inactive option. In rejecting claim 23, the Examiner stated that Moeller et al. further teaches that “the GUI is configured to allow selection of one of a trial use period, a limited use period, a pay-per-use period, and indefinite use period for the inactive option.” *Office Action*, 04/06/06, p. 2. However, such a feature is not disclosed or taught in the cited reference. Moeller et al. discloses that a user is free to use the scanner with the selected features for a desired period of time, and that the user is billed repeatedly over a set period of time. *Moeller et al.*, Col. 5, ll. 12-15. However, Moeller et al. makes no disclosure of the system being configured to allow a user a trial use period or a pay-per-use period as is called for in claim 23. Rather, as stated above, Moeller et al. discloses that a user is billed for a set period of time. Such a configuration does not allow for a free trial period or a pay-per-use option. As such, claim 23 is also patentably distinct over Moeller et al.

Claim 31

Claim 31, which is dependent from claim 17, further calls for the first communication interface therein to be a public communication interface, and the second communication interface therein to be a private communication interface. Similar to that which is described above regarding claim 17, Moeller et al. does not teach or disclose a first communication interface to be a public communication interface, and a second communication interface to be a private communication interface. Moeller et al. only teaches the system therein to make use of a single communication interface. As the request and activation performed in claim 31 are made over public and private communication connections respectively, they necessarily are made over two separate connections. The single interface taught and disclosed in Moeller et al. cannot be both a public and a private communication interface. As such, claim 31 is patentably distinct over Moeller et al.

**Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as Being Unpatentable Over Moeller et al. (USP 6,694,384) in View of Appellant's Admitted Prior Art**

Claims 20 and 24-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Moeller et al. (USP 6,694,384) in view of Appellant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). However, claims 20 and 24-29 are patentable over Moeller et al. and AAPA because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness falls on the Examiner. MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case, the Examiner must show three things. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2143. Here, the Examiner has failed to show that the combination of Moeller et al. and AAPA teaches or suggests each and every element of the claimed invention.

Claim 20

Claim 20, which is dependent from claim 17, calls for the remote device therein to be a medical device, including one of a cardiology device, a computed radiology device, a computed tomography device, a magnetic resonance imaging device, an x-ray device, an ultrasound device, a picture archiving and communication device, a nuclear medicine device, and a positron emission tomography device. As claim 20 is dependent from claim 17, all the elements of claim 17 are read into that which is called for in claim 20. As described above, Moeller et al. fails to teach or disclose that which is called for in claim 17. Specifically, Moeller et al. fails to teach or



disclose an enablement request to be made over a first communication interface and for transmission of a code over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface.

AAPA also makes no teaching, disclosure, or suggestion of an enablement request to be made over a first communication interface and for transmission of a code over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface. AAPA thus adds nothing to the teaching and disclosure of Moeller et al. that would render claim 20 obvious thereover. That is, AAPA merely discloses that medical imaging systems have, in the prior art, been configured to generically enable data exchange between a centralized facility and the remote medical imaging system. Nowhere, however, does AAPA suggest that this remote data exchange has the capacity to enable inactive options resident on the imaging system. Therefore, the combination of AAPA with Moeller et al. still fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the elements set forth in claim 20, pursuant to the chain of dependency from claim 17. As such, claim 20 is patently distinct over the cited references.

#### Claim 24

Claim 24 has been rejected under the combination of Moeller et al. and AAPA, as being obvious thereover. Claim 24 calls for, in part, a GUI to request activation of an inactive software program resident in memory of a medical imaging scanner remotely located from a centralized processing center having a software key generation tab, whereupon user selection of the software key generation tab transmits a data transmission over a public communication connection to the centralized processing center, and wherein the data transmission represents a request to activate the inactive software program resident in memory of the medical imaging scanner over a private communication connection.

The Examiner has asserted that “Moeller teaches a GUI to request activation of an inactive software program resident in memory of a scanner remotely located from a centralized processing center comprising... a software key generation tab, where upon user selection of the software key generation tab transmits a data transmission over a public communication connection to the centralized processing center, and wherein the data transmission represents a request to activate the inactive software program resident in memory of the scanner over a private communication connection.” *Office Action*, supra at 4-5. As set forth above with regard to claims 17 and 31, in the several embodiments of the system disclosed by Moeller et al., a feature enablement request and a key transmission are made over the same connection – either internet or telephone. As the request and activation performed in claim 24 are made over public and private communication connections respectively, they necessarily are made over two separate

connections. Such is not the case in Moeller et al., which clearly fails to teach or suggest communicating a feature request over a public communication connection and communicating a software key over a private communication connection. AAPA also makes no teaching, disclosure, or suggestion of such a public communication interface and private communication interface, as is set forth in detail above. Therefore, the combination of Moeller et al. and AAPA fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the elements set forth in claim 24. Thus, claim 24 is patentably distinct over the combination of Moeller et al. and AAPA.

#### Claims 25-29

Claims 25-29 further define the GUI called for in claim 24 and are patentably distinct over Moeller et al. and Appellant's admitted prior art at least pursuant to the chain of dependency. As described above, the combination of Moeller et al. and AAPA fails to teach, disclose, or suggest that which is called for in claim 24, and thereby fails to teach, disclose or suggest that which is called for in claims 25-29 pursuant to the chain of dependency from claim 24.

### **8. CONCLUSION**

In view of the above remarks, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner has provided no supportable position for the rejection of claims 17, 19-29, and 31. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the Board find claims 17, 19-29, and 31 patentable over the prior art of record and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

#### General Authorization for Extension of Times

In accordance with 37 C.F.R. 1.136, Appellant hereby provides a general authorization to treat this and any future reply requiring an extension of time as incorporating a request therefore. Furthermore, Appellant authorizes the Commissioner to charge deposit account no. 07-0845 the appropriate fee for an extension of time or any other fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Ziolkowski/

Timothy J. Ziolkowski  
Registration No. 38,368  
Direct Dial 262-376-5139  
tjz@zpspatents.com

Dated: October 2, 2006  
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.081

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin  
Registration No. 55,584  
Phone 262-376-5170 ext. 15  
krr@zpspatents.com

**P.O. ADDRESS:**  
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC  
14135 North Cedarburg Road  
Mequon, WI 53097-1416

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (Previously Presented) A method to access one or more inactive options resident on a device remotely located from a centralized facility comprising the steps of:

accessing a graphical user interface (GUI) electronically linked to a centralized facility and configured to facilitate selection from a number of option identifying parameters;

selecting at least one of the number of option identifying parameters for identification of one or more inactive options resident on the device;

transmitting an electronic request for activation of the selected one or more inactive options to the centralized facility, wherein the electronic request is transmitted via a public communication interface; and

authorizing transmission and installation of a software key in response to the electronic request, wherein the transmission of the software key is via a private communication interface such that the private communication interface electronically connects the centralized facility to the device.

2. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1 wherein the software key is configured to activate the one or more inactive options and is transmitted to and installed on the device.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1 further including the steps of inputting a system ID, a host ID, a client ID, and a password to gain access to the selection step.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of formulating the electronic request by:

inputting a user ID;

inputting a system ID;

selecting a modality;

selecting a software package; and

selecting a usage period.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1 further comprising the step of requesting use of the one or more inactive options for one of a trial period, a pay-per-use period, a limited access period, and an indefinite period.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1 further comprising generating a software key if the centralized facility grants access to the inactive option, wherein the software key is unique for each electronic request.

7. (Canceled)

8. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 2 wherein the software key is an alphanumeric code.

9. (Previously Presented) An access granting system comprising:  
a computerized network;  
a device having at least one non-enabled software application resident in memory thereon;

a plurality of computers connected to the computerized network, wherein at least one of the plurality of computers displays selection data to a user in a form of a graphical user interface (GUI);

a remote centralized facility electronically connected to the device and having a database, wherein the remote centralized facility includes a computer programmed to:

receive a host ID input, wherein the host ID corresponds to a physical location of the device;

identify a user selection of the at least one non-enabled software application;

receive a request from an authorized user requesting enablement of the identified user selection;

generate a software enabler designed to permit access to the selected non-enabled software application in accordance with the received request; and

transmit the software enabler from the centralized facility to the device.

10. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 9 wherein the computer of the centralized facility is further programmed to:

receive a system ID input;

identify a modality selection; and

decide whether to generate and transmit the software enabler based on the host ID input, the system ID input, and the modality selection.

11. (Original) The system of claim 9 wherein the computer of the centralized facility is further programmed to compare the request comprising a system ID, a host ID, a user ID, a selected non-enabled software application; and an identified modality to user and device data stored in the database, and generate the software enabler, wherein the software enabler is specific to the request and non-reusable.

12. (Original) The system of claim 10 wherein the computer of the centralized facility is further programmed to determine if the user is authorized to operate the selected non-enabled software application.

13. (Original) The system of claim 9 wherein the device is a medical component including one of a cardiology device, a computed radiology device, a computed tomography device, a magnetic resonance imaging device, an x-ray device, an ultrasound device, a picture archiving and communication device, a nuclear medicine device, and a positron emission tomography device.

14. (Canceled)

15. (Original) The system of claim 9 wherein the GUI is configured to authorize electronic communication between the centralized facility and the device.

16. (Original) The system of claim 9 wherein a user selection of a modality causes a list of available software applications to be displayed on the GUI.

17. (Previously Presented) A computer data signal process embodied in a carrier wave and representing a sequence of instructions originating from a computer program executed by a computer which, when executed by at least one processor, causes the at least one processor to:

display a GUI configured to facilitate a request over a first communication interface to enable an inactive option resident on a remote device;

receive an input of a device identifier;  
receive a selection of a usage period;  
receive a selection of an inactive option for enablement from the GUI;  
cause a remote centralized processing station to generate a code configured to enable the selected inactive option after successful processing of the received inputs and selections; and  
transmit the code to the device having the inactive option over a second communication interface different from the first communication interface.

18. (Canceled)

19. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the code includes an alphanumeric software key.

20. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the device is a medical device including one of a cardiology device, a computed radiology device, a computed tomography device, a magnetic resonance imaging device, an x-ray device, an ultrasound device, a picture archiving and communication device, a nuclear medicine device, and a positron emission tomography device.

21. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the GUI is accessible via a public communication network and configured to permit communication between a user station and the centralized facility.

22. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the set of instructions further causes the at least one processor to receive an input of a user ID, a client ID, a system ID, a facility ID, and a selection of a device modality and a software package from the GUI.

23. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the GUI is configured to allow selection of one of a trial use period, a limited use period, a pay-per-use period, and an indefinite use period for the inactive option.

24. (Previously Presented) A GUI to request activation of an inactive software program resident in memory of a medical imaging scanner remotely located from a centralized processing center comprising:

- a device modality selector;
- a system identification field;
- a user identification field;
- a software program selector; and

a software key generation tab, whereupon user selection of the software key generation tab transmits a data transmission over a public communication connection to the centralized processing center, and wherein the data transmission represents a request to activate the inactive software program resident in memory of the medical imaging scanner over a private communication connection.

25. (Original) The GUI of claim 24 wherein the device modality selector includes a drop-down menu and is configured to display a listing of device modalities including computed tomography, x-ray, magnetic resonance, echocardiography, ultrasound, nuclear medicine, and positron emission tomography.

26. (Original) The GUI of claim 24 further comprising a period-of-use selector.

27. (Original) The GUI of claim 26 wherein the period-of-use selector includes a drop-down menu configured to display, in response to a user push-button instruction, a usage period including a trial period usage, a limited-use period usage, a pay-per-use period usage, and an indefinite period usage.

28. (Original) The GUI of claim 24 wherein the data transmission is configured to represent a request to activate more than one inactive software program resident in memory of the medical imaging scanner.

29. (Original) The GUI of claim 24 further comprising a generate-and-receive button, wherein a user selection of the generate-and-receive button creates the data transmission and represents an authorization to request generation of a software key at the centralized processing center and transmit the software key to the medical imaging scanner.

30. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 9 wherein the computer of the centralized facility is further programmed to:

receive a user ID input; and

verify authorization of the user ID input to request enablement of the identified user selection.

31. (Previously Presented) The computer data signal process of claim 17 wherein the first communication interface is a public communication interface, and wherein the second communication interface is a private communication interface.



**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

-- None --

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

-- None --